



In re Patent Application of

BRADY et al

Atty. Ref.: 117-364

Serial No. 09/914,460

TC/A.U.: 2623

Filed: October 11, 2001

Examiner: B. Choobin

For: X-RAY IMAGE PROCESSING

\* \* \* \* \*

February 21, 2006

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated January 20, 2006, Applicants elect Group I (i.e., claims 76-82 and 101-117).

This election is made without traverse. However, since a restriction requirement is never proper unless the restricted group of claims is patentably distinct (i.e., inter alia, non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. Section 103) from the elected group of claims, the Examiner is requested to insure that such patentable distinctness is present before proceeding to make the requirement final.

Claim 118 depends from claim 101. Although this claim is not identified in the Restriction Requirement, Applicants respectfully request that claim 118 be examined along with the elected claims.


BRADY et al  
Serial No. 09/914,460

Moreover, multiply dependent claims 119-131 depend from, inter alia, various ones of the elected claims and Applicants respectfully request that claims 119-131 also be examined along with the elected claims.

Applicants reserve the right to file divisional application(s) directed to the non-elected claims.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:   
Michael J. Shea  
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:dbp  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100